

## REMARKS

### I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-2, 11-21 and 24-26 are pending in this application. In the January 11, 2010

Office Action, the Examiner:

A. Rejected claims 1-2, 11, 12, 17-20 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,931,018 to Fisher (hereinafter "Fisher") in view of US 6,763,023 to Gleeson et al. (hereinafter "Gleeson");

B. Rejected claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Gleeson and further in view of US Patent No. 6,658,027 to Kramer et al. (hereinafter "Kramer"); and

C. Rejected claims 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Gleeson and further in view of Kramer.

In this response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 11, 17, and 24. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

### II. Interview with Examiner

The amendments submitted herein are based at least in part on the suggestions provided by the Examiner during the telephone interview conducted on March 16, 2010. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite limitations similar to the limitations from claim 17 of “stopping generation of the table before MAC addresses of at least some devices operably

coupled through the first ingress/egress port are associated with the first ingress/egress port in the table.” In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the address table construction means includes a first operating state in which the MAC addresses associations for all of the ports are inserted into the table, and a second operating state in which the MAC the generation of the table is stopped before at least some of the MAC addresses associated with the first port are inserted into the table in a second operating state. Regarding the suggestion of incorporating the limitations of claim 14 into claim 1, Applicants believe that the claims, as currently amended, are patentable over the cited prior art without the limitations of claim 14.

## II. Claims 1, 17, and 24

Claims 1, 17, and 24 were each rejected as being obvious over Fisher in view of Gleeson. In this response, claims 1, 17, and 24 have each been amended to recite that the address table construction means includes a first operating state in which associations between MAC addresses and ports are inserted into the table for each of the first and the plurality of other ingress/egress ports, and a second operating state in which generation of the table is stopped with respect to the first port before MAC addresses of at least some devices operably coupled through the first ingress/egress port are associated with the first ingress/egress port in the table. As explained below, the proposed combination of Fisher and Gleeson does not arrive at a data switch that includes such limitations.

In the Final Office Action, Fishers was cited as disclosing all of the limitations of claims 1, 17, and 24 except for the limitation that the data switch is configured to not insert

the association when the data switch identifies that the MAC address is associated with the first port. Gleeson was cited as teaching the general concept that address learning may be disabled for a port. According to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to modify the data switch of Fishers so that it does not insert an address into the table when address learning is disabled for the port as taught by Gleeson.

Claims 1, 17, and 24, as amended, require that the address table construction means insert associations between the MAC origin addresses and all of the ports in a first operating state and stop generating the table with respect of the first port when in a second operating state. Neither Fishers nor Gleeson, alone or in combination, disclose or suggests such limitations.

There is no disclosure in Fishers regarding MAC address learning for the WAN interface port 144 of the home router 110 of Fishers. According to the Examiner, however, Fishers discloses a switch that “appears to be statically configured to never store associations between MAC addresses and the first port (WAN interface 144).” (Final Office Action, page 3). Whether or not this is true, there is no disclosure in Fishers of a switch or table construction means having a first operating state in which MAC addresses are learned in respect of all ports of the switch and a second operating state in which MAC address learning is stopped before at least some of the MAC addresses associated with the first port are inserted into the table.

Gleeson was cited for disclosing that address learning may be disabled for a port. Gleeson, however, was cited for disclosing that IP address learning may be disabled for a port. Gleeson does not disclose that MAC address learning may be disabled for a port. In

particular, Gleeson discloses that MAC address learning continues for a port even when IP address learning is disabled for the port. (Gleeson, col. 6, lines 27-54). Thus, Gleeson teaches away from disabling MAC address learning for a port. Consequently, there is no disclosure in Gleeson of a switch having a first operating state in which MAC address learning is enabled for each port of the switch and a second operating state in which MAC address learning is disabled for one or more of the ports.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Fisher and Gleeson fails to arrive at a data switch that includes an address table construction means having a first operating state in which associations between MAC addresses and ports are inserted into the table for each of the first and the plurality of other ingress/egress ports, and a second operating state in which generation of the table is stopped with respect to the first port before MAC addresses of at least some devices operably coupled through the first ingress/egress port are associated with the first ingress/egress port in the table. Accordingly, for at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 17, and 24, as amended, over Fisher and Gleeson should be withdrawn.

### III. Dependent Claims 2, 11-16, 18-21, 25 and 26

Claims 2, 11-16, 18-21, 25 and 26 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of one of the independent claims 1, 17, and 24. None of the modifications of Fisher or Gleeson proposed in connection with claims 2, 11-16, 18-21, 25 and 26 cures the deficiencies of Fisher and Gleeson with respect to amended claims 1, 17, and 24. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as given above for amended claims 1, 17, and 24, the rejections of claims 2,

11-16, 18-21, 25 and 26 over the prior art should be withdrawn as well.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event Applicants have inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, Applicants conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,

/David R. Moorman/

Attorney for Applicants  
Attorney Registration No. 59,323  
Maginot Moore & Beck  
Chase Tower  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109  
Telephone: (317) 638-2922